

- I AM HERE THIS EVENING ON BEHALF OF THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE THAT REPRESENTS OVER 1000 PEOPLE, MANY WHO ARE HERE THIS EVENING, WHO HAVE INDICATED THEIR WISH TO RETAIN THE LOVELY POND THAT HAS BEEN ENJOYED AND WELL USED BY THE RESIDENTS OF WINGHAM AND AREA FOR OVER 100 YEARS. OF COURSE, THAT POND HAS BEEN CREATED BY THE HOWSON DAM.
- AS WE HAVE MENTIONED TO YOU BEFORE, WE HAVE BEEN MEETING FOR OVER 6 AND A HALF YEARS AND, AT ONE POINT, WERE MAKING GOOD PROGRESS TOWARD A REPAIR PROJECT, WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF YOUR FORMER STAFF MEMBERS MRS. NEWSON AND MR. CHURCH.
- WE WOULD VERY MUCH LIKE TO WORK WITH YOU NOW TO FIND A SOLUTION TO THIS PROBLEM THAT WILL BENEFIT EVERYONE AND NOT LEAVE AN UNSIGHTLY SCAR ACROSS THE NORTH END OF TOWN, SIMILAR TO WHAT TOOK PLACE WITH THE LOWER POND AREA.
- ACCORDINGLY, OF THE OPTIONS SUGGESTED IN THE KGS REPORT, WE FAVOUR REHABILITATION OR, IF NECESSARY, REPLACEMENT.
- WE ALL KNOW THAT THE PRESENT DAM HAS BEEN SUBJECTED TO THE ELEMENTS FOR ALMOST 100 YEARS AND HAS NOT SEEN ANY SIGNIFICANT REPAIR WORK FOR ABOUT 30 YEARS, (EVEN THOUGH THERE WAS \$195,000 SITTING IN A RESERVE ACCOUNT FOR DAM MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR IN FEB. 2012), SO IT IS NOT A SURPRISE THAT KGS FOUND THE ABOVE-GROUND PORTIONS OF THE DAM TO BE IN POOR CONDITION
- UNFORTUNATELY, MOST OF THAT RESERVE ACCOUNT IS NOW BEING SPENT ON THESE ENGINEERING STUDIES!!
- HOWEVER, WE DO NOT UNDERSTAND HOW KGS CAN STATE THAT THE DAM IS UNSTABLE WHEN, FIRSTLY, THEY DID NOT INVESTIGATE THE FOUNDATION, AND SECONDLY, THE DAM HAS WITHSTOOD TWO SIGNIFICANT FLOOD EVENTS IN THE PAST YEAR – ONE OF THOSE WITH BEING THE 1 IN 100 FLOW, WITH SOME OF THE STOPLOGS IN THE NORTH SPILLWAY!!
- WE ALSO DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY KGS DETERMINED THE HAZARD POTENTIAL TO BE HIGH WHEN, ON PAGE 26 OF THE DAM SAFETY ASSESSMENT, THEY STATE THAT *“ENGINEERING JUDGEMENT SUGGESTS THAT THE EFFECTS OF THE DAM BREACH ARE MINIMAL IN THE POPULATED AREAS OF TOWN, AND THAT IT IS UNLIKELY THAT LOSS OF LIFE WOULD BE*

*ATTRIBUTED TO THE DAM BREACH. THIS FINDING WOULD LEAD TO THE SELECTION OF A LOWER HAZARD POTENTIAL CLASSIFICATION.”*

- WE ALSO QUESTION WHY THE NEWER, NORTH SPILLWAY AND THE EARTH EMBANKMENT BETWEEN THE OLD AND NEW SECTIONS OF THE DAM WERE NOT INCLUDED IN THE KGS STUDY.
- WE NOTE THAT, IN TWO PLACES IN THE STABILITY ASSESSMENT REPORT, KGS MENTIONS THAT “*THE DAM WAS ORIGINALLY BUILT TO PREVENT FLOODING AND TO CREATE A RESERVOIR FOR RECREATIONAL USE.*” WE DISPUTE THIS ASSERTION BY KGS AS OUR RESEARCH INDICATES THAT THE ORIGINAL DAM, WHICH WAS BUILT IN OR BEFORE 1862 (THAT IS 156 YEARS AGO), AND ALL SUBSEQUENT DAMS WERE CONSTRUCTED TO PROVIDE WATER POWER FOR VARIOUS TYPES OF MILLS.
- AS AN ASIDE, IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE THAT IN RECENT YEARS, THE SITE HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BY A PRIVATE COMPANY FOR THE GENERATION OF ELECTRICITY.
- THE MVCA SUGGESTS THAT REMOVAL OF THE DAM WILL REDUCE THE POTENTIAL OF UPSTREAM FLOODING BUT NO PROOF OF THIS HAS BEEN PROVIDED IN THE WAY OF REVISED FLOODPLAIN MAPPING WITH IT REMOVED. FURTHERMORE, THE CA OWNS AT LEAST 3 DAMS AND, AS FAR AS WE KNOW, IT IS NOT MOVING TO REMOVE THEM!!
- THE ONTARIO RIVERS ALLIANCE SUGGESTS THAT THE RIVER SHOULD BE RETURNED TO ITS NATURAL STATE – BUT, WE ASK, WHAT IS THE NATURAL STATE WHEN A DAM HAS EXISTED AT THIS LOCATION FOR OVER 150 YEARS?
- IT IS OUR SUGGESTION THAT COUNCIL NOT MAKE ANY QUICK, RASH DECISIONS ON THE FUTURE OF THE HOWSON DAM WITHOUT FULL AND COMPLETE INPUT OF THE PUBLIC. OF COURSE, WE UNDERSTAND THAT THERE MAY NOT BE CURRENT TAX DOLLARS AVAILABLE FOR THIS PROJECT BUT, WE BELIEVE THAT, THERE ARE OR WILL BE FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS THAT CAN BE ACCESSED FOR FUNDING AND, WHO KNOWS, PERHAPS SOME PRIVATE MONEY MAY ALSO BE AVAILABLE. MANY OTHER COMMUNITIES HAVE BEEN ABLE TO REHABILITATE THEIR DAMS – COMMUNITIES SUCH AS DELHI, MITCHELL, PORT DOVER, AYR, MILLBROOK AND CAMBRIDGE.
- THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION.